

Date: Fri, 1 Jan 93 04:30:20 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #1
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 1 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 1

Today's Topics:

 430mhz band under th
 True and correct information

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 31 Dec 1992 21:29:28 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!bobw@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 430mhz band under th
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

[Crossposting to rec.radio.amateur.policy where this discussion belongs]

From: bobw@col.hp.com (Bob Witte)
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc
Subject: Re: 430 mhz band under th (now repeater costs)
Date: 31 Dec 1992 21:22:01 GMT
Organization: HP Colorado Springs Division
Lines: 58
Distribution: world
Message-ID: <1hvo9pINNc63@hp-col.col.hp.com>
References: <RuTNwB5w165w@stat.com>
NNTP-Posting-Host: la.col.hp.com

gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) says:

>Repeater councils have developed several ad hoc rules over the years for

>handling frequency coordinations. They boil down to basically, first come,
>first serve, and use it or lose it. But these rules *are* ad hoc and have
>no legal basis in the federal regulations where 97.101(b) says that "No
>frequency will be assigned for the exclusive use of any station." That
>seems pretty clear. Under federal regulations, a repeater council has
>no authority to assign a channel for the exclusive use of any repeater
>station.

>

You've described the situation in Colorado. It's "first come" (those who were coordinated first way back when) "first served" as long as the repeater pair is "used". This puts the burden on the newcomer to move up in frequency to a higher band when the often-preferred bands like 144 MHz are full. The question then becomes: What does "used" mean?. This gets into the issue of "most effective use" and other vague notions.

By the way, the FCC has made it quite clear that it recognizes the "authority" of repeater councils and that the FCC will favor a coordinated repeater in any interference dispute.

>97.101(b) also says "Each station licensee and each control operator must
>cooperate in selecting transmitting channels and in making the most effective
>use of the amateur service frequencies." That also seems pretty clear,
>frequency usage must be on the basis of *most effective use*. That seems
>to paint small closed and private repeaters into a pretty tight corner
>when the spectrum is needed for more effective uses such as an open machine
>that serves a larger user base.

>

Yep, so the FCC puts the burden on the amateur community to sort this out. That's one reason why repeater coordinating bodies exist. Of course, they are made of humans and are subject to politics and other humanoid behavior.

As far as "most effective use" is concerned, I hear a can of worms being opened. How are we, the amateur community, going to measure Most Effective Use? Hours of key down time on a repeater? Number of users signed up as members? Number of autopatch calls :- (? Maybe hours of technical discussion on the repeater? Or maybe there's room for Autopatch repeaters, ragchew repeaters, ARES repeaters, closed repeaters, ...

Someone else jumped in a few postings back and suggested that a quiet channel was an effective use of the spectrum (I paraphrase a bit here). Maybe it is. Maybe having a frequency instantly available for emergency or priority communications over a long distance is "most effective use"?

So we might be able to agree that a closed repeater with two users that gets used 2 minutes per month is not the "most effective use" of the freq. As you move away from that extreme case (well, extreme for around here, I can't speak for California...) things get a bit fuzzier.

The view of our local coordinating body is that a repeater pair ought to be used for "something". It could be a handle of close buddies, it could be a "Ma and Pa repeater", it could be an experimental repeater, it could be "closed", it could be "open", but its OK as long as the freq gets used.

Bob Witte / HP Colo Springs / bobw@col.hp.com / KB0CY

Date: Thu, 31 Dec 1992 19:41:36 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!paladin.american.edu!darwin.sura.net!cs.ucf.edu!tarpit!ge-
dab!sunblossom!sunsmart!byrnes@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: True and correct information
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Keywords:

Comments about the FCC commercial license;
>It is required to be chief operator
>of a *broadcast* station, or for repair of marine radios.
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

This is false information the transmitter license holder is now the entity responsible for incorrect operation of the broadcast station. This was pushed by the NAB (National Association of Broadcasters) because they did not like paying engineers wages. So now the person working on the station transmitter can be anyone.

A license is still required for the marine service because of treatys.

Another thread talked about Type Accpetance(SP?) of radios and using business radios for ham frequencies. There are several business TA radios that will work in the ham bands and still not violate the TA. The important consideration of the FCC is that the radio can only be tuned by the operator to the preset frequencies. This is why there are no ham radios that can be used for business, since the vfo will allow the operator to tune to business frequencies not preset.

Some of the radios will tune 130-174 or more, and are still TA since the operator can only tune to the freqs programmed.

--
Arthur J. Byrnes

Disclaimer; These views are those only of the author, Arthur.

Date: 31 Dec 1992 07:43:36 GMT
From: cronkite.cisco.com!dstine@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec26.161259.14598@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1992Dec28.143224.14901@ulb.rit.edu>, <1992Dec31.000158.11575@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: Commercial radios on ham bands

In article <1992Dec31.000158.11575@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:
>In article <1992Dec28.143224.14901@ulb.rit.edu> cep4478@ulb.rit.edu
(C.E. Piggott) writes:

>>I've never asked anybody this question, but have been curious about it.
>>What's entailed in getting a commercial radiotelephone license? (testing,
>>fees, etc.) Is it more or less work than the ham licenses?
>
>You take a written exam, of about the same difficulty as the amateur
>Advanced exam. When I took it there was no fee, but that was many
>years ago.
>

My knowledge here is quite like no longer valid, but there used to be three
classes of Commercial Radiotelephone licenses:

First -- required for operating (ie, chief) engineer of a commercial radio
or TV station. There used to be a separate TV endorsement. This
used to be quite the heavy-duty test. The RADAR and TV endorsements
on this used to be very exhaustive as well.
Second -- you could be the operating engineer of a radio/tv station as long
as there was a First to look over your work
Third -- used to be required for DJ's and on-air people; was a simple
20-question technical and regulations test.

There also used to be three classes of commercial radiotelegraph tests; the
first class was all of the first-class 'phone test _and_ a 30WPM CW test. I'm
told that there are no longer any radiotelegraph licenses at all.

All this info is at least 10 years old, but I know a couple of people who had
"first-phone" tickets from the early 80's with the TV endorsements and they
were justly proud of the accomplishment.

dsa

Date: Wed, 30 Dec 92 17:41:37 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!rpi!
newsserver.pixel.kodak.com!laidbak!tellab5!balr!ttd.teradyne.com!
news@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1hm407INNqjn@network.ucsd.edu>, <1992Dec28.235602.1@ttd.teradyne.com>,
<8229@lib.tmc.edu>idb
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under thSKIP

In article <8229@lib.tmc.edu>, jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

> In article <1992Dec28.235602.1@ttd.teradyne.com> rice@ttd.teradyne.com writes:

>>Excuse Me ? "Invited" to use the spectrum. Where does the FCC say that ANY

>>Amateur has to be INVITED to transmit on a frequency?

>

> In Part 97, section 97.205, paragraph (e):

>

> S 97.205 Repeater station.

> (e) Ancillary functions of a repeater that are available to

> users on the input channel are not considered remotely controlled

> functions of the station. Limiting the use of a repeater to only

> ^^^

> certain user stations is permissible.

> ^^^

Yep, that's what it says. What it does NOT say, is that the owner/operator
has any exclusive ownership to the input or output frequency or right to
control who transmits on that frequency. All it says is that the owner/operator
can TURN OFF the repeater if they don't want the station on the input to
be repeated.

>

> This is devolving into a discussion about rules, and so belongs in

> rec.radio.amateur.policy; I've redirected followups there.

You are correct.

John Rice - K9IJ		"Did I say that ?" I must have, but It was
rice@ttd.teradyne.com		MY opinion only, no one else's...Especially
(708)-940-9000 - (work)		Not my Employer's.... Licensed since 1959
(708)-438-5065 - (bbs)		Ex: K8YZR, KH6GHC, WB9CSP, W9MMB, WA1TXV

Date: Fri, 1 Jan 1993 04:56:32 GMT

From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!crcnis1.unl.edu!
news.unomaha.edu!cwis!pschleck@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec28.235602.1@ttd.teradyne.com>, <8229@lib.tmc.edu>,
<1992Dec30.114924.1@ttd.teradyne.com>V

Subject : Repeater Warz (was Re: 430mhz band ...)

This has been an interesting thread, but I suspect that both sides in their extreme views are missing the main ideas of each viewpoint.

"As a licensee and station operator, I have absolute say over who operates my equipment."

Yes, you do, without question. If you put a repeater on a frequency, there is no obligation to retransmit all signals that appear on your input channel. If you offer it as an "open" repeater, there is an expectation to provide it as a service, but doing otherwise will only affect your public image (and possibly the status of your coordination, if the repeater pair was granted on condition of your service being "open").

"As the recipient of one or more coordinated frequencies, I own the channels."

Whoa, not quite. Coordination is an instrument of interference prevention/reduction, NOT an assignment of ownership. Having a coordinated repeater does not necessarily give you control over everything that is transmitted on your coordinated frequencies within line-of-sight range (usually 75-80 miles).

I agree that as repeater pairs fill up, this is likely to become a very controversial issue. The likely solution (I know of at least one east-coast coordinator that is considering this) is to use automated monitoring tools to gather usage statistics on all coordinated repeaters and make low-usage (or substantially non-conflicting in the time-domain) pairs or triplets of repeaters share a channel, with the use of PL and/or directional/notched antenna arrays.

A repeater pair assignment CANNOT, for the sake of the state-of-the-art, be a transfer of ownership, in perpetuity, of radio frequencies over a wide geographic area. Coordinating bodies made the mistake of unconditionally assigning channels in "unwanted" frequency ranges, without making them conditional on future usage patterns and technology considerations. The FCC took the gutless path of stating that they will not endorse coordinating bodies, while simultaneously claiming that in the case of conflict, the "coordinated" repeater will win out in

interference disputes.

A messy situtation, to be sure.

73, Paul W. Schleck, KD3FU

pschleck@unomaha.edu

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #1
